

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. These claims were rejected
as follows:

Claims / Section	35 U.S.C. Sec.	References / Notes
1-4, 7-13 & 16-20	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jakob, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,600); and• DuFaux (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,252).
5, 6, 14 & 15	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jakob, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,600);• DuFaux (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,252); and• Rafii, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,838).

5 Applicant thanks the Examiner for his constructive comments made during
the telephone interview and willingness to conduct the interview. This
Amendment After Final is based on the understanding reached during this
interview.

10 Applicant has amended independent device claim 1 and independent
method claim 10 to more specifically claim the invention. Namely, the following
limitations have been added to both claims: 1) the input device is in the form of a
wristband or wristwatch; and 2) the projection surface is the back of a human
hand.

15 Although the limitations have previously been addressed on an individual
basis, the present combination of claim elements has not previously been

presented. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has already located all relevant art for the amended claims and thus the present amendment does not raise new issues that would require further searching. Applicant's arguments below are with respect to these newly amended claims.

5 Applicant's use of reference characters below is for illustrative purposes only and is not intended to be limiting in nature unless explicitly indicated.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a), CLAIMS 1-4, 7-13 & 16-20 OBVIOUSNESS OVER JAKOB IN VIEW OF
DuFAUX**

1. *The present amendments to the claims claim subject matter that is not*
10 *obvious over the combination of Jakob and DuFaux.*

The present amendment has combined features in the independent claims that limit the invention to a device integrated into a wristband or wristwatch that projects the control buttons onto the back of a user's hand. Contrary to the statement of the Examiner in the OA on p. 3, third paragraph, with respect to
15 claim 4 asserting that DuFaux teaches the virtual image may be projected downward on an angle onto virtually any surface, Applicant respectfully asserts that DuFaux only teaches a very limited projection scheme that does not obviate the present invention.

Figs. 10 and 11 and appertaining descriptive portions in the Specification
20 of DeFaux teach a projection mechanism that is fixedly mounted to a rigid

surface that is flat. With the claims as amended, there are notable distinctions over such a fixed mounting.

First, when the projection mechanism is worn on a wristband or wristwatch, the distance and angle of the projection onto the back of the hand is not rigidly controlled. Furthermore, in this configuration, there may be relative movement between the projected image and the projector that would have to be accommodated. Additionally, the back surface of a hand presents a less-than-even surface, and possible variations in skin tone, even within-person variation over time due to skin tanning, etc. Finally, in such a configuration, the projector and the projected image must be in relatively close proximity in order to work properly. DeFaux's system discloses a projection unit that is at least twice the distance of the length of a human hand away from the projected image.

Although Jakob does disclose a wrist-wearable control device for a hearing aid, it operates on a completely different principle (an inductive operation with an antenna and transmitter) and thus could not address the issues noted above that are uniquely presented by the projection device of the present invention in view of the teachings of DeFaux.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a), CLAIMS 5, 6, 14 AND 15 OBVIOUSNESS OVER JAKOB IN VIEW OF
DuFAUX AND RAFII**

2. *Applicant relies on the arguments made above with respect to the independent claims.*

In the OA, on pp. 4-5, the Examiner indicated that claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Jakob, DuFaux and Rafii. The Examiner added the Rafii as teaching elements of these four dependent claims, namely the scalability and
5 freely programmable nature of the projected elements.

Without addressing these arguments on the merits, Applicant relies on the above arguments and asserts that Rafii fails to teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Jakob and DuFaux, all of the elements of the independent claims.


10 For these reasons, the Applicant asserts that the amended claim language clearly distinguishes over the prior art, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection from the present application.

CONCLUSION

15 Inasmuch as each of the objections have been overcome by the amendments, and all of the Examiner's suggestions and requirements have been satisfied, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered, the rejections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

20

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,877)
Mark Bergner



Appl. No. 10/777,834
Reply to Final Office Action of April 12, 2006

Response under 37 CFR §1.116 expedited
procedure . Examining Group: 2615 (MPEP
714.13)

5

SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5779
Attorney for Applicants
Customer Number 26574

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on June 29, 2006.

15